

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF EQUICOM COMMUNICATIONS,)	
INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC)	
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO OPERATE)	CASE NO. 89-127
AS A RESELLER OF INTERLATA)	
TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES WITHIN THE)	
COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that Equicom Communications, Inc. ("Equicom") shall file the original and ten copies of the following information with the Commission, with a copy to all parties of record. The information requested herein is due no later than July 31, 1989. If the information cannot be provided by this date, Equicom should submit a motion for an extension of time stating the reason a delay is necessary and include a date by which it will be furnished. Such motion will be considered by the Commission.

1. Exhibit C, page C-3, states in part "(t)he LEC routes the calls to Equicom through a Feature Group D (FG D) access arrangement, and the calls are then carried over leased facilities to a Northern Telecom DMS-250 Digital Tandem Switch, located in Columbus, Ohio." Provide a complete description and identify the ownership of the leased facilities referred to in this sentence.

2. Provide a clear and legible sketch showing how Equicom will be providing intrastate service. This sketch should include:

a. Identification of all of Equicom's switching locations, points of presence, and operator service centers.

b. Identification of all facilities and/or services used to connect customer's premises to Equicom's points of presence or switching locations. Identify the ownership of these facilities.

c. Identification of all facilities and/or services used to connect Equicom's points of presence or switching locations. Identify the ownership of these facilities.

d. Identification of the facilities and/or services used to bridge operators onto a call placed over the Equicom network. Identify the ownership of these facilities.

3. In reference to the facilities identified in the previous question:

a. If the facilities are provided by carriers pursuant to approved tariffs, identify these carriers and identify the specific tariffs involved.

b. If the facilities are leased, provide a copy of the leasing agreement or any other contract specifying the terms and conditions of the agreement between Equicom and its facilities-based carriers.

4. Does Equicom own and/or operate any transmission facilities in the state of Kentucky or any other jurisdiction? If so, provide a description of these facilities.

5. Does Equicom have any affiliation with any other company which owns and/or operates any transmission facilities? If so, describe.

6. Explain in detail Equicom's calling card validation capabilities.

7. Please reference Exhibit D, page D-2. Explain how Equicom arrived at these estimates. If estimates are based upon a market study, provide a copy of this study.

8. Provide a listing of financial institutions with which Equicom has a line of credit. State Equicom's credit line with each of these institutions.

9. Provide a toll-free number or provision for accepting collect calls, and point of contact, for customer complaints.

10. The response to Item 11 of Exhibit E refers to Indiana. Is this response applicable to Kentucky also?

11. Please refer to Section 3.2(B) of Equicom's tariff. Explain why it is appropriate for chargeable time to begin once a connection is established between the calling party and the operator for Operator-Station and Person-to-Person calls, whereas for Calling Card or Credit Calls, chargeable time begins when the called party has answered.

12. How will Equicom handle directory assistance requests, and what charge, if any, will be made?

13. State whether Equicom is aware of the provisions of the Kentucky Public Service Commission Administrative Case No. 273¹.


14. State whether Equicom is aware of the potential impact of Administrative Case Nos. 323 and 328,² currently pending, that may apply to Equicom's Kentucky operations.

¹ Administrative Case No. 273, An Inquiry into Inter- and IntraLATA Intrastate Competition in Toll and Related Services Markets in Kentucky.

² Administrative Case No. 323, An Inquiry into IntraLATA Toll Competition, an Appropriate Compensation Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls by Interexchange Carriers, and WATS Jurisdictionality; Administrative Case No. 328, Investigation into whether WATS Resellers should be Included in the ULAS allocation Process.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 10th day of July, 1989.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:

Executive Director